

**CITY OF BOULDER, COLORADO**  
**BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING MINUTES**

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| <b>Name of Board / Commission:</b> Water Resources Advisory Board  |                    |
| <b>Date of Meeting:</b> 20 October 2014  |                    |
| <b>Contact Information of Person Preparing Minutes:</b> Andrea Flanagan 303.413.7372   |                    |
| <b>Board Members Present:</b> Vicki Scharnhorst, Mark Squillace, Lesley Smith, Ed Clancy<br><b>Board Members Absent:</b> Dan Johnson   |                    |
| <b>Staff Present:</b> Jeff Arthur, Director of Public Works for Utilities<br>Robert Harberg, Principal Engineer - Utilities<br>Katie Knapp, Engineering Project Manager<br>Annie Noble, Flood and Greenways Engineering Coordinator<br>Kristin Dean, Utilities Planner<br>Bret Linenfelser, Water Quality and Environmental Services Manager<br>Chris Douville, Wastewater Treatment Manager<br>Andrea Flanagan, Board Secretary<br><b>Cooperating Agencies Present:</b><br>Alan Turner, Senior Project Manager, CH2M HILL   |                    |
| <b>Meeting Type:</b> Regular   |                    |
| <b>Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order</b>   | <b>[7:00 p.m.]</b> |
| <b>Agenda Item 2 – Approval of the 15 September 2014 Meeting Minutes:</b><br>Motion to approve minutes as amended from September 15th as presented.<br>Page<br>Moved by: <b>Squillace</b> ; Seconded by: <b>Smith</b><br><b>Vote: 4:0</b>  | <b>[7:01 p.m.]</b> |
| <b>Agenda Item 3 – Public Participation and Comment</b><br><b>Public Comment:</b> None<br><b>Board follow up:</b> None   | <b>[7:02 p.m.]</b> |
| <b>Agenda Item 4 –</b><br><b>Public Hearing and Discussion of Gregory Creek Mitigation Alternatives</b><br>Katie Knapp and Utilities staff presented the item to the board, which included a Prezi presentation.<br><br><b>Executive Summary from the Packet Materials:</b><br>The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a general summary of the preliminary proposal for flood mitigation measures to facilitate improved flood conveyance along Gregory Canyon Creek as it traverses the City of Boulder from Flagstaff Rd. to its confluence with Boulder Creek.<br><br>The city has retained CH2MHill to evaluate potential alternatives to help alleviate future flooding along Gregory Canyon Creek. CH2MHill has conducted a study of the creek corridor and developed three sets of categorical options which would improve flood conveyance. These categories include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improvements in Public Right-of-Way and Easements;</li> <li>2. Improvements outside Public Right-of-Way and Easements; and,</li> <li>3. Improvements for street conveyance.</li> </ol> <p>CH2MHill’s Alternative Analysis Memorandum (“Analysis”) is included as Attachment A. This analysis contains a detailed description of the data and models used to determine the improvements which would help flood conveyance along Gregory Canyon Creek. The intent of the draft mitigation plan is to identify various types of improvements which could be constructed along the creek corridor in order to discern the costs and benefits associated with each improvement, or group of improvements, and to prioritize these improvements.</p> | <b>[7:03 p.m.]</b> |
| <b>WRAB Discussion Included:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions about whether or not there has been a cost benefit analysis performed yet?</li> <li>• Questions regarding staff’s sense of potential merits of using street conveyance as an option?</li> <li>• Suggestion to consider alternative safety signage in the event of a flood to prevent bottle necks and involve the University through outreach to student housing.</li> <li>• Discussion regarding private culverts and if there is a potential plan to address this.</li> </ul>  |                    |

- Questions about whether there has been positive feedback about the drainageways and easements.
- Comments about the need to clear cars, grills and fences from areas that are prone to flooding. Questions as to what thought is given to providing instructions and educational programs for people when there is a flood?
- Questions about whether smaller group meetings could take place with property owners/ early adopters interested in getting larger culverts, driven by neighborhood groups rather than city government. Possible way to get more people on board to consider this plan for street conveyance.
- Discussion about looking into smaller detention and viable ways to help keep culverts clear.
- Questions about if smaller detentions on open space a viable option?
- Questions about how many private culverts exist?
- Questions to the board about whether the approach to smaller culverts is reasonable or should larger culverts be considered.
- Discussion around how the city gets buy-in for the city to maintain a conveyance system, as there are reservations for the city to spend money without buy-in from the residents who would benefit.
- Question if city has talked to residents about setting up a watershed focus group to discuss watersheds that the city could cooperate with.
- Mention of potential to provide incentives for community and city to work together to clean out streams and keep trees down to collectively solve issues.
- Question about costs associated with clearing areas around houses in high hazard zone.
- Statement that street conveyance option has broad support among community and appears to be a cost-effective option. Is this a fair guess of what we are likely to see?
- Question about if this watershed will flash quickly during a storm event?
- Question about whether the city has spoken with landowners in the Willow Brook area about ideas on how to better protect their properties?
- Discussion of putting soccer field in the low-lying area where the major flow would take place.
- Request to see more discussion about outreach to community in advance and during rain events.

**Public Comment:**

- **Keith Pearen** – Lives near Flatirons Elementary School, really appreciates where city is going with their plan and agrees that conveying a 100 year flood out of the question. Read study in its entirety. Alternatives proposed do not necessarily match what actually happened on the ground during the flood. Problematic area during this event that may not adequately be addressed at 7<sup>th</sup>. Does not have a strong feeling on option three in the roadway. Feels that spending money to make the roads convey without hurting property is money well spent. People are open to having flood mitigation done on their properties, but there are possible challenges there. Impressed with how accurately earlier studies match up with what was seen during the flood event. May be able to leverage earlier studies going forward.
- **Justin Hoffenberg** – Lives midway on creek and has specific question regarding two maps and noticed there is a chart in attachment A that shows different culverts and what improvements would look like in a 10-year plan or maximum culvert (35x6). The 10 and 50 year maps only show maximum 50-year extent. Comments were heard during open house questioning this finding showing 35 foot culverts on the 10-year map, which isn't actual benchmark for 10-year event. Requests clarification whether the maps reflect 10-year or maximum numbers and asks if maps need updating.
- **Scott Hoffenberg** – Wants to thank the board for hearing the neighborhood last year and putting neighborhood's name out there for potential for growth, which shows a lot of thought. Concerns about map showing 35-foot culvert and hopes that Board will take closer look at document from CH2M Hill to address and consider street conveyance. Appreciates Board taking a closer look at this creek and looks forward to the future.
- **Laszlo Nemeth** – Didn't have problems like University and 7<sup>th</sup>. Suggests putting energy into conveyance because Mother Nature is going to decide, not what planners decide. Water went back into Gregory Creek because a car diverted it. This area is packed with cars and not enough parking.
- **Tom Manteuffel** – Lives on College and appreciates looking into this issue. Mentioned culvert at College Avenue, which was filled with fences and BBQ grills that were piled into

culvert, forcing water to run over the creek onto other properties. Suggests looking at this issue and better advising people not to put objects in the creek bed. Mentioned 22-foot wide culvert at Aurora and feels that a 35-foot culvert is too excessive.

- **Hal Totten** – Lives on College, family built house in 1950. At height of flood, banks took all the flood waters, bank to bank and held a 1.5 – 2 feet of water before touching his foundation. Some of the street did have water conveying and he built diversion with 2x4's which diverted water down College, past Flatiron Elementary School. According to charts – what happened on College is being compared to what happened on Pennsylvania, which are not comparable. Stone bridge on his property has weathered 3 major storm events in his lifetime, which is a good model.
- **Brad Sclar** - Lives below Anderson Ditch. Asks what kind of incentive programs are being considered for property owners to keep stream beds clean?
- **Paul Shankman** - Lives at 7<sup>th</sup> and Pleasant and thinks that street conveyance is a good idea. With some work on 7<sup>th</sup>, a lot of the damage could have been avoided. East side was severely damaged. Could make a difference in the future with better street conveyance.

**No Board action was requested at this time.**

**Agenda Item 5 – Matters**

**[8:11 p.m.]**

**From the Board:**

Board Member Smith brought up the below matter(s):

- Question regarding businesses and water bills, would there be incentive and/or adjustment to stormwater bills if these large surface areas can be converted from pavement to a more pervious surface area, which could potentially be reflected in their bill?

Board Member Clancy brought up the below matter(s):

- Requested to extend water quality report warning on fluoride in city's drinking water for seven individual groups of vulnerable populations to address more specifics surrounding fluoride in infant formula. Asking that a CDC warning be included on the report and on the city's website, modeling that of other city municipalities.
- Feels that people should be properly noticed.
- Expressed concerns for higher risks of fluorosis in infants due to fluoride in water.
- Asked the question if there exists an annual report on wastewater treatment effluent that is made available to the public?
- Noticed that Boulder Reservoir water levels are low. Asked if this is something the city controls and monitors?

Board member Scharnhorst brought up the below matter(s):

- Questioned whether a utility bill insert would suffice as a means to providing information about CDC's opinion on study of fluoride in drinking water that may affect infant baby formula.
- Expressed that if we start down the path of providing information to the public about fluoride, then Council should be prepared to put the topic back on the ballot.

Board member Squillace brought up the below matter(s):

- Expressed concern that if a recommendation is made to the public about fluoride in water, that it could create a fury for people to react to, which should be carefully considered.
- Suggests before making any recommendations, that all consequences be considered and caution should be exercised to prevent triggering reactions in the general public.

**From Staff:**

**[8:31p.m.]**

- **Chris Douville and Bret Linenfelser will provide some brief updates on wastewater treatment and nutrients.** *Topics included:*
  - Permit compliance items regarding energy efficiency
  - Nutrient Management Grant
  - Nitrogen Upgrades Design Project
  - Permit renewal due and will expire in April, 2016
  - EnerNOC Demand Response Program
  - Alternative energy and options to modify and modernize cogeneration
  - Process optimization studies
- **South Boulder Creek:** Still waiting for additional information from CH2M Hill about scenarios involving University property.
- **Wonderland Creek Mitigation:** Funding is not atypical, need Council's authorization for potential imminent domain. First reading in November and second reading in December, which would be a last resort for negotiations.

- **Lower Bear Canyon Creek:** Board approved a motion recommending approval of the mapping study. It will be presented to Council at a later time.
- **Boulder Slough:** Board approved a motion recommending approval of the mapping study. It will be presented to Council at a later time.
- **Skunk, Bluebell, King's Gulch:** Additional work was completed on 15<sup>th</sup> and Mariposa and this topic will be revisited with the board at a later time with notable updates.
- **Frasier Meadow's Neighborhood:** Lining the wastewater collection system appears to be effectively reducing infiltration. Suggestion made for staff to put together outreach materials for residents.
- **Budget:** Recommendation for rate increases go to City Council on October 21<sup>st</sup>.

**Agenda Item 6 – Future Schedule**

**[9:00p.m.]**

- Possible November 8<sup>th</sup> WRAB retreat to be scheduled to discuss priorities and interests for 2015.
- November: Update on Upper Twomile Goose Creek
- December: Update on Betasso CIP
- January 26<sup>th</sup> meeting is scheduled for 4<sup>th</sup> Monday rather than 3<sup>rd</sup> for WRAB board meeting, due to Martin Luther King Jr. holiday
- February 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting is scheduled for 4<sup>th</sup> Monday rather than 3<sup>rd</sup> for WRAB board meeting, due to Presidents' Day holiday.

**Adjournment**

**[9:27 p.m.]**

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, by motion regularly adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

**Motion to adjourn by:** Squillace; **Seconded by:** Smith

**Motion Passes 4:0**

**Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:**

The next WRAB meeting will be Monday, 17 November 2014 at 7:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 1777 Broadway, 80302.

APPROVED BY:

ATTESTED BY:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

---

An audio recording of the full meeting for which these minutes are a summary, is available on the Water Resources Advisory Board web page.